



IN THE PATENT AND TM OFFICE

Art Unit 3679

Appn. Number: 09/516,655

Filing Date: 03/01/00

Applicant: Thompson, Thomas C.

Appn. Title: Retrofit Hurricane-Earthquake Clip

Examiner: Garcia, Ernesto

Mailed October 14, 2003

AMENDMENT G

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Alexandria, VA

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 07/29/03, I have included in this response the following:

1. Response to drawings objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).
2. Response to specification objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 (d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).
3. Response to claim objections.
4. Sheet of geometric angles versus sheet metal angles.
5. Response to claim rejections- 35 USC § 103.
6. Response to allowable subject matter.
7. Copy of amended claims, using revised amendment practice.
8. Certificate of Mailing.

Very respectfully,

*Thomas C. Thompson*  
Thomas C. Thompson

RECEIVED  
OCT 21 2003  
GROUP 3600

3679  
10/27/03  
#19E

## RESPONSE

### DRAWING AMENDMENTS

1. **Drawings:** The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the acute angle (claims 2 and 3), the acute angle offsetting the blocking webs from the base web (claim 5), and the opposite directions (claim 5) must be shown or the features canceled. The applicant has amended the claims to satisfy the objection. In claim 1d, line 1, the applicant has changed "having an acute angled bend" to --having a first acute angled bend--. On claim 1d, line 2, the applicant has changed "and another acute angled bend" to and a second acute angled bend-. Now claims 3, 4, and 5 have prior antecedent basis to claim 1 in relation to first and second acute angled bends. On claims 3 and 4, the applicant has deleted "generally horizontal" in relation to the acute angled bends. Now the acute angles stated in claims 3, 4, and 5 have a prior antecedent basis in claim 1 and no drawing corrections are required, since the two acute angle bends are shown on the figures.
2. The applicant has enclosed a sheet with figures A-D and A<sup>1</sup>-E<sup>1</sup> to help the examiner understand what the pro se inventor is trying to convey in the claims. The left side of the sheet shows geometric angles; figures A-D, and the right side shows sheet metal bends; figures A<sup>1</sup>-E<sup>1</sup>. Figure B shows a geometric acute angle. The line is brought up from the bottom (figure A) to form the acute angle. Figure B<sup>1</sup> shows sheet metal bent at an acute angle. Unlike a line, the sheet metal cannot be bent up from itself. It's confusing to the applicant, but on figure B<sup>1</sup>, even with the big obtuse angle between the metal, the bend has only been bent at an acute angle. Figure D<sup>1</sup> shows the metal bent at an obtuse angle. Depending on the thickness and type of metal, this isn't too common because it can form cracks at the bend. Finally, figure E<sup>1</sup> shows that the sheet metal has been bent up at three acute angles (a<sup>1</sup>, b<sup>1</sup>, and c<sup>1</sup>) to get 90°. Geometrically, there are three obtuse angles inside (a, b, and c), which of course cannot add up to 90°. If the applicant were to ask a fabricator for sheet metal bent at 45°, he would get figure B<sup>1</sup>, not figure D<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, the applicant respectfully asks the examiner if the claims are technically correct with the acute angle bends as stated for sheet metal bends. That is, are "acute angled bends" the same as "bent at an acute angle"?